



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/967,167

09/28/2001

Hao-hua Chu

10745/027

4931

26529

7590

10/26/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN/PDC  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/967,167

Applicant(s)

CHU ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-20 and 43-53 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7-10, 21-23, 25-34 and 38-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6, 24 and 35-37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 18 August 2006, to the Original Application, filed 28 September 2001.
2. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 21-23, 25-34, and 37-42 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft Specification Document Version 17", Harmonia, Inc, hereafter referred to as "Harmonia") in view of Templeman (U.S. Patent 5,845,303).
3. Claims 1-53 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 21, 32, 42, 43, and 53 are independent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 21-23, 25-34, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "User Interface Markup Language (UIML) Draft

Specification Document Version 17", Harmonia, Inc, hereafter referred to as "Harmonia") in view of Templeman (U.S. Patent 5,845,303).

**As per independent claims 1, and 21 and dependent claims 2 and 23,** Harmonia discloses a system and method of dynamically adapting a presentation generated by an application to a display screen of any of a number of different device platforms including a) providing a number of graphical user interface components in a hierarchical configuration, the graphical user interface components being platform independent with respect to the number of heterogeneous device platforms. (See Harmonia, Page 23, Section 6.4), b) arranging the graphical user interface components on a page as a function of the hierarchy (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1), and where b) includes nesting, or identifying graphical user interface components that represent the lowest hierarchical level and a highest layout priority within the hierarchical configuration (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1, Paragraph 2).

Harmonia does not disclose expressly c) creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming one or more of the graphical user interface components to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the different device platforms running the application than filled without transformation.

Templeman discloses adjusting or transforming the size of a GUI component to maintain consistent relationships between frames when frame sizes change (See Templeman, Figure 4, and Column 8, lines 39-48). Templeman further discloses that metaforms, or GUI components, may be customized for use with a particular display

Art Unit: 2176

type or size to optimally utilize available screen space (See Templeman, Column 5, lines 27-29).

Harmonia and Templeman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating graphical user interfaces.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the arrangement and transformation of graphical user interface components of Ikemoto with the method of adapting a presentation to heterogeneous device platforms of Harmonia. The motivation for doing so would have been to optimally utilize the available screen space on a particular output device. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Templeman with Harmonia for the benefit of optimally utilizing the available screen space on a particular output device to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 2, 21, and 23.

**As per dependent claim 3**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Templeman also discloses that constraints are defined to allow an object or GUI component to contract, or reduce in size based upon the display device (See Templeman, Column 8, lines 42-44). Harmonia and Templeman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating graphical user interfaces. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the reduction in size of a GUI component based upon the display capacity of Templeman with the method of adapting a presentation to heterogeneous device platforms of Harmonia. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain consistent relationships between components as the display size of

the display device changes. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Templeman with Harmonia and Templeman for the benefit of maintaining consistent relationships between components as the display size of the display device changes to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

**As per dependent claims 7 and 28**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses applying a set of style guide parameters to each of the graphical user interface components to create uniformity in the visual appearance of the graphical user interface components (See Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5).

**As per dependent claim 8**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Harmonia also discloses arranging the graphical user interface components as a function of properties specified by the application (See Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5, paragraph 1).

**As per dependent claim 9**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Harmonia also discloses generating a set of proposed device platform specific pages (See Harmonia, Page 10-11, Section 3.1.3) and selecting at least one device platform specific page from the set to display the graphical user interface components with the display screen (See Harmonia, Page 23, Section 6.3, paragraph 1 – Description).

**As per dependent claim 10**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Harmonia also discloses sizing each of the proposed device platform specific pages as a function of the graphical user interface components

arranged to form each of the proposed device platform specific pages (See Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5, paragraph 2).

**As per dependent claim 22**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the hierarchical configuration is an intermediate representation including a number of container nodes, such as frames, and a number of component nodes, the component nodes representing the graphical user interface components (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1, paragraph 3).

**As per dependent claim 25**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the graphical user interface components include device platform independent graphical user interface components (See Harmonia, Page 9, Section 3.1).

**As per dependent claims 26 and 27**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses transforming the graphical user interface components to graphical user interface components that are specific to the target device platform and transforming a composite graphical user interface component including a number of graphical user interface components to a composite graphical user interface component that is specific to a target device platform (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1).

**As per dependent claim 29**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the target device platform includes one of a pager, wireless phone, personal digital assistant, hand-held personal

computer, vehicle navigation system, and notebook personal computer (See Harmonia, Page 5, Section 1.3, paragraph 4 – “Device”).

**As per dependent claim 30**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the transformation module is operable to generate a set of possible device specific pages of various sizes and select therefrom (See Harmonia, Page 5, Section 1.3, paragraph 7 – “Rendering”).

**As per dependent claim 31**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Harmonia also discloses that the target device platform includes any one of a number of different device platforms (See Harmonia, Page 5, Section 1.3, Paragraph 6 – “Platform”).

**As per independent claim 32**, Harmonia discloses an article of manufacture having one or more recordable media storing instructions thereon which, when executed by a system, causes the system to dynamically adapt a presentation generated by an application to a display screen of any of a number of heterogeneous device platforms according to a method including a) providing a number of graphical user interface components in a hierarchical configuration, the graphical user interface components being platform independent with respect to the number of heterogeneous device platforms (See Harmonia, Page 23, Section 6.4), and b) arranging the graphical user interface components on a page as a function of the hierarchy (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1).

Harmonia does not disclose expressly c) creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming one or more of the graphical user interface



Art Unit: 2176

components to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application then filled without transformation.

Templeman discloses adjusting or transforming the size of a GUI component to maintain consistent relationships between frames when frame sizes change (See Templeman, Figure 4, and Column 8, lines 39-48). Templeman further discloses that metaforms, or GUI components, may be customized for use with a particular display type or size to optimally utilize available screen space (See Templeman, Column 5, lines 27-29).

Harmonia and Templeman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating graphical user interfaces.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the arrangement and transformation of graphical user interface components of Ikemoto with the method of adapting a presentation to heterogeneous device platforms of Harmonia. The motivation for doing so would have been to optimally utilize the available screen space on a particular output device. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Templeman with Harmonia for the benefit of optimally utilizing the available screen space on a particular output device to obtain the invention as specified in claim 32.

**As per dependent claim 33**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 32 as described above. Harmonia also discloses nesting, or identifying graphical user interface components representative of the lowest hierarchical level and

Art Unit: 2176

a highest layout priority within the hierarchical configuration (See Harmonia, Page 24, Section 6.4.1, paragraph 2).

**As per dependent claim 34**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 32 as described above. Templeman also discloses that constraints are defined to allow an object or GUI component to contract, or reduce in size based upon the display device (See Templeman, Column 8, lines 42-44). Harmonia and Templeman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating graphical user interfaces. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the reduction in size of a GUI component based upon the display capacity of Templeman with the method of adapting a presentation to heterogeneous device platforms of Harmonia. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain consistent relationships between components as the display size of the display device changes. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Templeman with Harmonia and Templeman for the benefit of maintaining consistent relationships between components as the display size of the display device changes to obtain the invention as specified in claim 34.

**As per dependent claim 38**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 32 as described above. Harmonia also discloses applying a set of style guide parameters to each of the graphical user interface components to create uniformity in the visual appearance of the graphical user interface components (See Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5).

**As per dependent claim 39**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 32 as described above. Harmonia also discloses arranging the graphical user interface components as a function of properties specified by the application (See Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5, paragraph 1).

**As per dependent claim 40**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 32 as described above. Harmonia also discloses generating a set of proposed device platform specific pages (See Harmonia, Page 10-11, Section 3.1.3), and selecting at least one device platform specific page from the set to display the graphical user interface components with the display screen (See Harmonia, Page 23, Section 6.3, paragraph 1 – “Description”).

**As per dependent claim 41**, Harmonia and Templeman disclose the limitations of claim 40 as described above. Harmonia also discloses sizing each of the proposed device platform specific pages as a function of the graphical user interface components arranged to form each of the proposed device platform specific pages (See Harmonia, Page 25, Section 6.5, paragraph 2).

**Independent Claim 42** is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 18 August 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on Pages 16-20 of the Instant Amendment that Harmonia in combination with Templeman fails to teach creating a device platform dependent presentation by selectively transforming at least one graphical user interface component to adjust the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of a display screen of one of the heterogeneous device platforms running the application. The Office respectfully disagrees. Templeman teaches that metaforms, or GUI components, may be customized for user with a particular display type or size to optimally utilize available screen size. As shown in Templeman, Figure 4, the size of the GUI components may be increased, thus adjusting the size of the page to be closer to the maximum fill of the display screen (see Templeman, Figure 4, showing that the GUI objects have the ability to expand in size. See also Templeman, Column 8, lines 42-48 and lines 54-67). Templeman further teaches that the GUI components may be selectively transformed, such as adjusting the size of a particular component to accommodate additional data (See Templeman, Column 8, lines 60-67).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 11-20 and 43-53 are allowed.

7. Claims 4-5, 24, and 35-36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

Art Unit: 2176

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**